ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum - GAC Preparation for the Meeting with the ICANN Board
Monday, March 22, 2021 - 13:15 to 14:00 EST

GULTEN TEPE: Gulten, now we are ready.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Great. Thank you very much, Gulten, and thank you for your patience everyone. This is a session for preparation to our meeting with the Board it is scheduled originally for 45 minutes. We now have like 40 minutes and we have a very long list of questions. 13 I believe, so -- and we have for the meeting itself we have 60 minutes, so I hope we can, as we go through the questions, we can try to identify questions that could be merged, questions that we can communicate maybe in writing, so just to be practical and allow time for a good discussion of the questions, and allowing time for responses, and maybe even follow up from GAC colleagues after the question is asked and the response is provided.

So with this in mind let's go through the questions. And I will not be reading the background, again for the sake of time, so I think we can go straight ahead to the questions,

and I hope our topic leads will also help us in this exercise fine tuning the questions and trying to reduce the list. I see the slides saying a total of 16 questions so practically speaking it's very difficult to thoroughly discuss 16 questions in 60 minutes. So with we go to the first topic and first question?

So first question is new gTLD subsequent procedures, and the first question reads does ICANN Board foresee an interaction between the ICANN Board and ICANN org and the GAC in parallel to its consultation with the SPIRT on GAC consensus advice? So this is the first question, and I think this question was repeated several times during our discussions and leads also topic leads if you want to chime in any time, just let me know. And Kavouss, that's an old hand?

IRAN: No, it's a new hand. In this regard we have to take account of discussions that we had at the beginning of this meeting, what our French colleagues mentioned and what I mentioned that we have to include that. Thank you.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry Kavouss, if you can explain, include in the question? Or you mean the background information or where exactly?

IRAN: No, when you come to this SPIRT we have to mention what we mean by SPIRT. What is the participation in SPIRT and was the equal right, what is equitable access so not to forget the issue you raised in the background but if it you come to that we have to see what is our reaction in this thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss, but I think during the meeting with the Board we will not have that much time so and again this is an open discussion so please let me know how would you like me to run the session.

Frankly I was not planning to go through word by word background part but rather go to the question directly, so if there is any fine tuning to the question, I think it would be appreciated at this point in time but I fully understand

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

Kavouss there was a substantial discussion during the previous session but I'm not clear where to reflect this begin the tight time and the long list of questions. But again let's see how we will end up. I see Jorge's hand up and then Kavouss. Jorge, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Manal. This was just to point to the fact that precisely, we had drafted and this question after the webinar we had on SubPro with this aspect raised by France, first of all, and then discussed today to ask the Board what was its opinion about this recommendation regarding SPIRT, and if if you look at the context it really goes to that point so I don't know if Kavouss or France or any one wants to fine tune the language, but as you said, perhaps that should be now. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Jorge. Kavouss, please go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, I believe the question -- the second line should be changed. Does the ICANN Board foresee an interaction

between the ICANN Board or ICANN org on the GAC on the issue of SPIRT? Take into account that the GAC advice should not be subject to the decision by the SPIRT. And also, equitable participation and equal right of the GAC representatives -- not one -- in the SPIRT. The -- so we should not say that does -- the Board allow that, we say that our view on the consensus is quite clear. We don't want that our consensus with nobody according to the bylaw is directed to the GAC -- to the ICANN Board goes to any other entity for judgment, and so on and so forth.

This is result of our consensus, and the only entity is Board, if they don't agree with that with the 60% of opposition, they should come back to us and discuss with us and come -- find some conclusion. We don't want that to bring a new layer on that. So please modify the text to convey this message. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Kavouss. I see Rob already trying to capture what you said in the -- on the slide, and if it's not accurate appreciate if you can type a different formation

FRANCE:

Yes, thank you very much, Manal. I hope you can hear me and see me. okay, well thank you very much first for taking our ideas into account regarding the SPIRT and form -- the GAC Board meeting. I would like to say that in our eyes the question that has been proposed is accurate, at least it does reflect our concerns since it asks if the Board does foresee -- well, are that the GAC could also be included in this consultation about the SPIRT.

The exclusion of the GAC from such future dialogue as was proposed is our concern, we would very much like to know if the Board would be ready to include the GAC in its future dialogue. But regarding Kavouss's, Kavouss's proposal, we think it is, it is quite relevant, but perhaps a slightly different topic. Well it is part of the same problem how GAC advice will be treated, by SPIRT or by the Board and the SPIRT off the launch of the future round. But but they are not exactly the same they're not exactly the same topic. So I think we should keep these 2 questions

separate.   We can definitely add Kavouss's concerns regarding the managing of GAC advice after the managing of the future round because it is also our very own concern.

But yes, just to say that they should be kept separate. But maybe we in France, and maybe we were not clear enough during our discussions between the last few weeks, so all GNSO, if that were the case but we need to keep these divisive issues well -- distinct from each other even though they are definitely part of the same issue. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Vincent, and so, in order not to be dragged in a drafting session, let me go quickly through the questions, we want to make a full iteration and then maybe come back and see how we can merge or fine tune or if there are questions that could be removed but I think for now we are we may not be able to go through the full list, so with that in mind we will return to this question again, but let's at least continue the new gTLD subsequent rounds and then see how we can manage it.

If we can go to the following slide, and what are the ICANN Board's thoughts on next steps for DNS abuse mitigation on trigger the holistic efforts mentioned within the SubPro PDP work group final report vis-a-vis the GAC positions not to proceed with a new round of gTLDs until after the complete implementation of the recommendations in CCT-RT relative to DNS abuse mitigation and more specifically being on this item being addressed before the next round of new gTLDs -- before the next round of new gTLDs begins.

So again, this is a question on subsequent rounds and DNS abuse, I'm not sure whether we would like to keep it, merge it, or sent it in writing, but again let's continue to the following question. And please start thinking how we can reduce the list. If we can go to the following question, please.

GULTEN TEPE: Manal maybe before we move on you should give the floor to Nigel.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Nigel, go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Nigel Hickson, U.K., no problems with this sort of question but in the earlier dialogue we had ahead of this ICANN session I think that you know the thoughts of the U.K. is that the question needs to be a bit broader, for this, and you know that, it can be a different context.

It's not just the DNS abuse recommendations. It's other recommendations flowing from the CCT-RT as well so -- and you know really, it's to seek the Board's view on how we are going to take forward the appropriate recommendations. The ones labelled to be you know significant and important ahead of the next round but clearly, we can work on this. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel, noted and I think there is another question that lists specific recommendations as well so maybe we can think whether we can merge both together and meanwhile as we go to the following

question allow me to read France in the chat regarding EPDP France supports the distinction between legal and natural persons registration data and the continuation of Phase 2A we trust that group to achieve consensus and ambition recommendations we propose that the GAC convey a common support message for the continuation of Phase 2A during the GAC GNSO [inaudible] at the ICANN69 public forum the Board stated this work has started. And by this work, just a second. By this work this is referring to an objective and independent analysis of cost-benefit analysis, so the question is could the ICANN Board inform the GAC of the status of this work?

Next please. Can the Board react to this resolution in light of the GAC Montreal communique? And the resolution is the GNSO resolution where the GNSO council requested to the Board consider and direct the implementation of the outputs adopted by the GNSO council without waiting for any other implementation -- for any other proposed or on going policy work. I think we received a verbal response to this from from Philippe during the leadership poll, and he indicated that he did not mean the GAC Montreal

advice, but again with this in mind let us go to the following question.

And the question reads we would like to ask the Board whether they could kindly update the GAC on their ongoing consideration of this advice and in particular the recommendations marked as prerequisite or high priority namely, and there is a list of questions -- recommendation numbers? Again I hope we can try to merge questions or remove them or start to share them in writing but let's keep moving.

Just to have one quick iteration and then decide how to proceed. Next on DNS abuse what is the view of the Board on the conclusions of the SSR2 report on DNS abuse. Would the Board consider taking shorter measures in particular based on contractual enforcement to address well identified issues in parallel to launch ago longer term policy process? And what is the view of the Board on these recommendations which seem to be in line with standard cybersecurity practices, and on the possibility to swiftly implement them?

And those are also recommendations from the SSR to the Board so again these consider prioritization merging, and deletion. Let's move on. How is the Board going to ensure swift implementation of the SSAD? Keep going please. I'm just trying to catch up with the chat. You may start by leaving [inaudible] only in writing so when we are back, we see which one was 4. Registration data and WHOIS, is the ICANN Board in support of a more transparent WHOIS system where nonpersonal data could be publicly available? Should the work not be prolonged, what are the Board's intention with regards to the issues currently addressed under Phase 2A?

Would there be consideration of other procedural options to ensure that these issues of importance to the public interest would be properly addressed can go to the following slide? Thank you, Jorge, for noting that [inaudible] interest. So on the screen we have what is the Board's reaction to the GNSO position? How it will be ensured that the public policy objectives pursued by the thick WHOIS policy and the EPDP will achieved and gone, GNSO position here the GNSO… regions 7 is to modify the thick WHOIS transition policy?

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

Then with is the perspective of the Board on improving the accuracy of gTLD registration data and beyond the scoping exercise on accuracy does the Board, envisage short terms measures for example in terms of contractual enforcement to help enth secure the accuracy of registration data. Do we still have more questions? We do so GAC members are interested to hear about the progress ICANN org is making to address those recommendations, and the reference here is to WorkStream 2 recommendations that have been assigned to it directly or where ICANN wide co-operation is needed to produce -- to proceed with implementation.

So, now Jorge suggestion to put questions in this section in writing so any objection to moving the -- I don't see a question under onboarding and engagement. This is for the info -- and by the way everything in this file has already been shared with the Board so the information is there, and any objections to conveying the question number 16 in writing? And not face-to-face during the session? I see Kavouss's hand up.

IRAN: Yes, Manal. Thank you again. How many question we have all together? We have 60 minutes, how many questions we have.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We have 16 questions.

IRAN: 16 so divide 60 minute by 16. 4 minutes per question. 3 and a half minutes. 1 minute to reading the question, 3 minutes for reply. Too much. Too many, many. Too many, so we have to categorize that we have to prioritize that down so on and so forth and we have to have a very better time management that for each question sometime if we reduce the number, I think 16 questions too much. Maximum 5. Maximum. Or 6. ten minutes or 12 minutes but not more than that it's impossible to have 16 questions, never ever we had 16 question up to now. Never ever. Thank you.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Cannot agree more, Kavouss. Can agree more so let's try in the remaining time to reduce them together so Jorge please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you so much Manal. Jorge Cancio for the record from Switzerland. I would suggest just very generally that we focus on the 3 big blocks subsequent procedures, DNS abuse, and registration data, and on all those 3 blocks we structure the agenda accordingly about the Board.

Devote about 15 minutes to each block so we leave 15 minutes at the end to have a sort of civility or for other issues and try to address the Board on the 3 blocks because they have received in writing and then highlight perhaps one or two questions by block. And see what the Board responds and the rest of the questions we would ask them that if they are not responding that they respond in writing.

And with that I think we would have an overall structuring of the session, and now, regarding which specific questions to pick, maybe we can now use the rest of this

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

session to do that, and then also perhaps trust our leadership or management team as Kavouss said to do the fine tuning. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much Jorge. Very constructive proposal, so if we can try to look at each section and reduce our questions to one or two, agree that we should maintain the themes, the main headings but try to work out the questions. Kavouss is this a new hand?

IRAN:

Yes, is a new hand. I fully agree with Jorge. He says 3 areas. Means 3 question. I need to add a 4th question. Agenda issue about EPDP whether Phase 2, Phase 2A which is not covered in those 3 questions.

We have 4 all together. 4 by 15 means 60 and we don't need the 15 minutes for final adjustments so please kindly try to guess the 3 issues Jorge mentioned plus with the people from the GAC representative in EPDP Phase 2 and 2A I have another question of a general nature with respect to the EPDP Phase 2 and 2A. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, thank you Kavouss. Of so now under subsequent procedures, we have the question on SPIRT, and I sensed that there is a wish to keep the question but also -- Jorge please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Manal. And just if it's helpful, I try to be very brief -- I would prioritize question one on the SPIRT because it has raised a lot of attention in the GAC, I would prioritize 2 question 2 merging it probably with question 5, and I would leave question 3 and 4 in writing. So question 1 merged 2 and 5, and 3 and 4 in writing if that is workable.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Question 1. Merge 2 and 5 and leave 3 and 4. Any objections or endorsements? I see Nigel agreeing to merge 2 and 5 and no ha agreeing, so thank you for the proposal Jorge, we will drop 3 and 4. Have one and ask for help to merge 2 and 5. And meanwhile, let's go to the second theme which is DNS abuse mitigation, and here I see we have 2 questions, what is the view ever of the Board

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

on the conclusion of SSR2 and the rest of the question, and then what is the view of the Board on these recommendations again in relation to SSR2?

So are we -- am I missing something? And what is the view of the Board? I see more questions on the screen. Okay. So it was a compound question that is now broken into two. So we have all the DNS abuse questions on the screen, any suggestions and I think they all relate to the SSR2 but the second one is asking about whether the Board is considering short term measures. So any if suggestions I see Velimira asking to keep question 7 and Nigel suggesting to merge 6 and 8. Makes sense to me Kavouss please go ahead. Yes, I...

IRAN: 6 and 8 together and if you can combine and, 6 and 8, and if you want to say something about 7, you may put it as a supporting or something else in a written form but not raising formally because it may eat the whole time. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Kavouss. Any objections to dropping 7? Velimira are you suggesting keeping it separate or are you insist and keeping it on the list?

VELIMIRA GRAU: [Inaudible] Kavouss, I hear you about the fact that it takes time of the question is let's say question 7 was a much more precise question compared to 6 and l so if you don't mind, Manal, if I can come back to you no you in the chat within a few minutes you can go through the other slides. I think this should be an efficient way to go forward.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure. Sure. Thank you. The thank you very much Velimira so let's go to the following section and at least we have an idea to merge 6 and 8.

IRAN: Manal, may I have a suggestion.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please go ahead.

IRAN: Thank you very much for your consideration. I believe that you sent this question to the Board to study in order to prepare for reply. You have your 4 question, and in the covering note or whatever you sent is says that in relation with these 4 questions there are additional or supplementary issues that would help the Board to prepare the reaction with respect to these 4 main issue.

And then for instance put 7 in one of those supplementary or supporting elements for question 3 for instance. So you do not totally eliminate that but you don't raise it as a question, but give it to the Board maybe they want to kept that one so I leave it to you, and to the management team to dry to have a 2 category. One category a main question. The other category is supplementary or supporting material to the 4 questions, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Kavouss. Very practical suggestions so the messages from some questions would go more into an introductory thing rather than a question, so thank you for the suggestion. Meanwhile, as we avoid Velimira's

response let's continue. -- WHOIS, WHOIS registration data so how is the Board going to ensure a swift implementation of the SSAD?

This is one question, and second question is the Board in support of a more transparent system where nonpersonal data would be publicly available, and then should the work not be prolonged what are the Board's intentions with regard to the issues currently addressed under Phase 2A, and I have also, I have heard this question several times so I'm assuming that you would like to keep 11. Would there be consideration of other procedural options to ensure that these issues of importance to the public interest would be properly addressed?

And the last question what is the perspective of the Board on improving the accuracy of gTLD registration data beyond the scoping exercise on accuracy does the Borden envisage short term measures in terms of contractual enforcement to help improvement the accuracy of data registration. So 5 questions under WHOIS, and we want one or two so any questions to Rob first? And any questions to be merged?

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

I see Nigel, U.K. suggesting to merge 14 and 15. Okay. So both in relation to accuracy, and again by verge I hope we can come up with one question, and not a compound question or both, so any other suggestions? Is the Board' reaction to the GNSO reaction regarding the thick WHOIS. Is this is something -- Olivier please go ahead European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Hello yes Olivier Bringer, European commission for the record. I would like to keep 2 questions at least so the ones we have just merged on accuracy for what's important, and also the first one on the implementation of the SSAD. so if these 2 questions could be kept, as oral questions to the Board that would be great, thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Olivier, so the first question is how is the Board going to ensure a swift implementation of the SSAD right? So we have one question to keep, and 2 questions to merge, and 2 more questions to decide upon. Questions that we need to decide on? Should the work not be

prolonged, what are the Board's intention regarding Phase 2A? And -- I'm lost. Rob can you help me?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. you actually have 4 questions that are still.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: To be decided, 10, 11, 12, and 13 so those array over slides 15 and 16. . I think you've already reached your count so I'm by default putting them in writing at least in blue and I will change that to red if anyone objects. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Rob. And we have also reached the top of the hour, so any further suggestions? I think we will be trying to reflect what we have agreed in the shorter settled questions with the help of support staff, but if there is any, anything you want to flag as a must have, please say this now, otherwise, we will work on a version that will be

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

circulated of course to the whole GAC membership but also to, to the Board since our session is tomorrow, reading in the chat we do believe 7 is a more useful question but we accept to delete it if no support for it.

So, thank you Velimira for the flexibility. Again being respectful of the time of everyone, we will try to do the merge, the good thing is that we are not adding questions now, so I hope this will be helping the Board and not otherwise.

So let's work it off line, and ensure that everything is okay with the topic leads and the entire GAC and circulated to the Board, and if need be we can take a few minutes from the GAC communique predrafting review session which is immediately after -- before I mean the meeting with the Board, again for any very last minute fine tuning if needed but nothing to change as we will be, in fact, starting our meeting with the Board, so we will not be able to mess with the set of questions, Kavouss, this is a new hand.

IRAN:

Yes, this is a new hand. Please kindly when you present this at the beginning of the meeting with ICANN Board please kindly mention that we are 4 question, if I am not mistaken, and only we have a sharp 15 minute per question and we don't expect more than 15 minutes because the other question needs also to be carefully considered. So you try to manage and make some agreement with the ICANN Board that their answer will be limited to cope with that 15 minutes time thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much Kavouss. I think you mean 15 minutes Per section and it's a good way to structure our discussion to make sure we cover all the themes and all the sections so with this I appreciate you giving the leadership a little flexibility and the topic leads to re-work our questions. We will circulate it to everyone, I hope it will reflect accurately everything we agreed during this session.

With this, I thank you very much for your attention and participation, this brings us to the end of this preparatory

session, it's now time for a 30 minute break, and then we will have 2 more back-to-back sessions one on planning and finance, update by ICANN org, and the second one is a social informal social gathering and I hope that everybody will be able to join despite being optional of course. So please be back in the Zoom room at 1430 Cancun time. 1930UTC.

Thank you, everyone.

[END OD TRANSCRIPT]